

Appl. No.: 09/977,112

Amd. Dated March 18, 2005

Reply to Office Action of January 13, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of the rejections set forth in the Office Action dated January 13, 2005 is respectfully requested. Claims 1-28 are currently pending and have been rejected. Claims 7-17 and 28 have been amended.

Claims 7-16 have been amended to recite a wireless transceiver device. Support for these amendments may be found in the Specification, as for example on page 8 at lines 8-10. Claim 13 has also been amended to recite that a first device is a roaming device. Support for this feature may be found in the Specification, for example, on page 9 at lines 12-22. Claim 17 has been amended to provide proper antecedent basis. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter has been added with the amendment to claim 17, as a database has been described in one embodiment as being a memory (Specification, page 9 at lines 1-4). Claim 17 has further been amended to recite that the transceiver device is a wireless transceiver device. Support for this amendment may be found in the Specification, as for example on page 8 at lines 8-10. Claim 28 has been amended to recite an access point rather than a transceiver device in an effort to maintain proper antecedent basis.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 7-10, 14, and 15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, because the Examiner believes the claims contain subject matter which was not described in the Specification. Specifically, the Examiner alleges that "claims 7, 8, 9, 10, 14, and 15 contain first device which is not described in the Specification." The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner, and submit that the first device is described in the Specification. A first device which interfaces with a transceiver device may be a roaming device as described in the Specification, for example, on page 9 at lines 12-22 and from page 10 at line 19 to page 12 at line 9. A first device is also described in the Specification on page 5 at lines 18-25.

Appl. No.: 09/977,112
Amd. Dated March 18, 2005
Reply to Office Action of January 13, 2005

Claim 7 recites means for generating a record associated with the first device, and on page 11 of the Specification at lines 4-5, the creation of a record for a roaming device is described. As the Applicant believes that a first device is clearly described in the Specification, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw his rejections of claims 7-10, 14, and 15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-11, 13-24, 27, and 28 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,758,281 issued to Emery et al. (hereinafter "Emery"). Claims 12, 25, and 26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Emery as applied to claims their respective base claims and, further, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,414,635 issued to Stewart et al. (hereinafter "Stewart").

Discussion of Emery Reference

The Applicant submits that a mobility controller (MC) of Emery appears to provide wireless mobile communications and communicate with an Integrated Serves Control Point (ISCP) (Emery, column 11 at lines 45-54). The ISCP is part of a linked, non-wireless portion of a network (Emery, column 12 at lines 47-52), and is shown in Figs. 1 and 2 of Emery as only communicating through a common channel inter-office (CCIS) packet switched data link (Emery, column 10 at lines 30-32). Hence, it is respectfully submitted that the MC, which may be a cellular mobile controller or a PCS mobile controller (Emery, column 10 at lines 18-20), of Emery may be a wireless transceiver whereas the ISCP is not a wireless transceiver as the ISCP is taught by Emery as only communicating through packet switched data links.

Appl. No.: 09/977,112

Amd. Dated March 18, 2005

Reply to Office Action of January 13, 2005

1. Claim 1 and its dependents

Claim 1 recites a wireless transceiver device which interfaces with a roaming device, and includes computer code for causing static input information to be accepted and stored in an editable field of a memory. The memory is part of the wireless transceiver device. The wireless transceiver device also includes computer code for causing a record associated with the roaming device to be generated. The record includes the static input information and is stored on the memory.

It is respectfully submitted that Emery does not teach of a wireless transceiver device which includes computer code for causing static input information to be accepted and stored in an editable field of memory. For example, in the passage cited by the Examiner on page 3 of the Office Action, Emery teaches that an ISCP updates registration data with identification data. As discussed above, an ISCP is not a wireless transceiver device. While the mobility controller may be a wireless transceiver device, it is the ISCP and not the mobility controller that updates registration data with identification data. There is no teaching or suggestion that the mobility controller causes static input information to be accepted and stored in an editable field of memory. It is also noted that Emery does not appear to teach that static data is accepted by either the ISCP or the mobility controller, or that there is an editable field of memory in which the static data is stored. Accordingly, claim 1 is believed to be allowable over Emery for at least these reasons.

Additionally, Emery also does not appear to teach that a wireless transceiver device includes computer code for causing a record associated with a roaming device to be generated and stored in memory on the wireless transceiver device. While Emery teaches that a registration data portion of a home location register (HLR) may be updated (Emery, column 19 at lines 45-51), it is an ISCP and not a mobility controller that updates the registration data portion of the HLR. The ISCP is not a wireless transceiver device, as discussed above. Further, such a registration data portion is not stored in memory on the wireless transceiver device. It appears that the registration data portion of the HLR is located on the ISCP (Emery, column 19 at lines

Appl. No.: 09/977,112

Amd. Dated March 18, 2005

Reply to Office Action of January 13, 2005

33-35), which is not a wireless transceiver device. It is noted that Emery specifically teaches, at lines 31-33 of column 19 that "...the HLR containing data regarding the PCS handset and its user is not associated with a mobility controller" (emphasis added). Therefore, claim 1 is also believed to be allowable over Emery for at least this additional reason.

Claims 2-6 each depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 1 and are each also believed to be allowable over Emery for at least the reasons set forth with respect to claim 1. Each of these dependent claims recites additional limitations which, when considered in light of claim 1, are believed to further distinguish the claimed invention over the art of record. By way of example, claim 6 recites that the wireless transceiver device is an access point. It is respectfully submitted that Emery clearly does not teach of an access point which includes the features of the wireless transceiver device as claimed. The ISCP of Emery is not an access point. As such, claim 6 is further believed to be allowable over the cited art for at least this additional reason.

Dependent claim 5 recites that static input information is a location associated with a wireless transceiver device. The Examiner has argued that Emery teaches of such a limitation. At lines 5-14 of column 20 of Emery, Emery appears to teach of a validation procedure which identifies a mobility controller (MC). There is no teaching of or suggestion that a procedure which identifies an MC actually gives a location associated with the MC. Further, there is no teaching that any location, let alone a location associated with the MC, is static input information (*i.e.*, static input information that is stored in an editable field of a memory of a wireless transceiver device as required in claim 1 from which claim 5 depends). Emery teaches that a location of a PCS handset can be known to its ISCP if the handset is in any area of a mobility controller (Emery, column 20 at lines 10-14), but does not teach of a location of the mobility controller being known. Therefore, claim 5 is believed to be allowable over the cited art for this additional reason as well.

Appl. No.: 09/977,112
Amd. Dated March 18, 2005
Reply to Office Action of January 13, 2005

2. Claim 7 and its dependents

As amended to recite a wireless transceiver device, claim 7 recites similar limitations as recited in independent claim 1. Therefore, claim 7 and its dependents are each believed to be allowable over the cited art for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1.

3. Claim 17 and its dependents

Independent claim 17, as amended, recites a method for utilizing a wireless transceiver device. The method includes limitations that are similar to those recited in independent claim 1. As such, claim 17 is believed to be allowable over the cited art for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 18-23 each depend from claim 17. Therefore, each of claims 18-23 is believed to be allowable over the cited art for at least the reasons set forth. Each of these dependent claims recites additional limitations which the Applicant believes further distinguishes the claimed invention over the art of record. By way of example, claim 16 requires that the wireless transceiver device is an access point. The Examiner has indicated that he believe that an ISCP is an access point. It is submitted that the ISCP of Emery is neither a wireless transceiver nor an access point. As such, claim 16 is further believed to be allowable over the cited art for at least this additional reason.

4. Claim 24 and its dependents

Claim 24 recites a method of configuring an access point which includes positioning the access point at a desired location, determining an address of the desired location, and storing the address in a memory field associated with the access point.

In the Office Action, the Examiner has argued that Emery teaches the method of claim 24. The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner. Emery does not teach of

Appl. No.: 09/977,112
Amd. Dated March 18, 2005
Reply to Office Action of January 13, 2005

positioning an access point at a desired location at lines 31-38 of column 26, as argued by the Examiner. As discussed above, an ISCP is not a wireless transceiver device or an access point. Hence, positioning an ISCP in different geographic regions is not the same as positioning an access point or even an MC at a desired location.

Emery also does not teach determining the address of the desired location of an access point. In teaching that an MC can locate an ISCP (Emery, column 19 at lines 58-60), Emery fails to show determining the address of a desired location of either an access point or the MC, which may be a wireless transceiver device. Further, it is submitted that Emery also fails to teach of storing an address of the desired location of an access point in a memory field associated with the access point. Emery does not even suggest that an MC (which Emery appears to teach as a wireless transceiver device) has a memory field into which any address, let alone the address of the MC, may be stored. Therefore, claim 24 and its dependents are believed to be allowable over the cited art for at least these reasons.

Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, the Applicant believes all the pending claims are in condition for allowance and should be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would in any way expedite the prosecution of the application, please do not hesitate to call the undersigned at (408) 446-8690.

Respectfully submitted,



Peggy A. Su
Reg. No. 41,336

RITTER, LANG & KAPLAN LLP
12930 Saratoga Ave., Suite D1
Saratoga, CA 95070
Tel: 408-446-8690
Fax: 408-446-8691